

Appl. No. 10/812,725

Amdt. Dated August 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed June 15, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 15, and 20 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 15, and 20 have been cosmetically amended herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Before proceeding with the various objections and rejections, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Elkassabgi for indicating that Claims 3-9, 14, and 16-20 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 was objected to for a minor informality. In response, Applicants have cosmetically amended dependent Claim 2 to rectify the minor informality. As such, withdrawal of the claim objection is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,373,160 (Schrod1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 relates to a generator that includes a rotor frame having a cylindrical body, a drive shaft coupled to the cylindrical body, a first rotor armature coupled to the inner surface of the cylindrical body and defining a space to receive a stator assembly and recites, *inter alia*, a second rotor armature coupled to the outer surface of the cylindrical body and electrically coupled to the first rotor armature.

Schrod1 relates to an electric machine that includes a casing having a stator (1) with two stator windings (2, 3) and two mechanically independent rotors (4, 5). The rotors (4, 5) rotate about the same rotational axis and electromagnetically interact with the stator (1). However, because the rotors (4, 5) are mechanically independent, the rotors may rotate at different rotational speeds (col. 1, ll. 5-12). This is clearly shown in FIG. 1, in which the inner rotor (4) is rotationally mounted to a case via suitable bearings (6).

Appl. No. 10/812,725

Amdt. Dated August 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

The outer rotor (5) is mounted on the inner surface of a cylindrical frame, which is rotationally mounted independently of the inner rotor (4), via another set of suitable bearings (7).

Hence, it is clear that Schrod1 fails to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least the above-noted feature of independent Claim 1. Namely, Schrod1 fails to disclose or suggest at least a second rotor armature coupled to the outer surface of the cylindrical body and electrically coupled to the first rotor armature.

In view of the above, and because Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Schrod1, U.S. Patent No. 6,768,237 (Schroed1), and U.S. Patent No. 6,236,134 (Syverson), and independent Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Schrod1 and Schroed1. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, at least the above-noted feature of independent Claim 1 that is not disclosed in Schrod1. Moreover, upon review of both Schroed1 and Syverson, Applicant submits that these references also fail to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least this feature. Namely, neither Schroed1 nor Syverson, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least a second rotor armature coupled to the outer surface of the cylindrical body and electrically coupled to the first rotor armature.

In view of the foregoing, and because dependent Claims 10-13 depend from independent Claim 1, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 15, and 20 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite

Appl. No. 10/812,725

Amdt. Dated August 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 8/22/05

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060